

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**I. Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 Anticipated by Underwood**

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,100,195 to Underwood (“Underwood”) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 1 and 30 are independent claims. Claims 2-13, 18-29, 46 and 47 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 31-33, 35-39, and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30. Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 30 Not Anticipated By Underwood

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1 and 30 are directed towards a method and system, respectively, for providing authorized remote

access to one or more application sessions. These independent claims recite a collection agent gathering information about a client node and a policy engine making an access control decision based on information received from the collection agent. Underwood fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Underwood fails to make an access control decision based on information about the client node received from the collection agent. Although Underwood determines a browser type of a client, Underwood does not use the browser type for access control decisions. Rather, Underwood controls access to a web page solely through page sequence security (*Underwood, Col. 61, lines 49-67*). The Examiner's observations of Underwood that "information regarding the user and the session is gathered using various scripts" and that "a determination is made based on the gathered information as whether the user is permitted access to the requested content" do not refer to the same information. The information regarding the user and the session is the "user component", which contains the user identifier, browser type and version, while the gathered information for the access control determination is the "activity component", which contains the current page and previous page records. The user component is used for user interface generation (*Underwood, Col. 58, lines 1-5*), and only the activity component is used for access control (*Underwood, Col. 62, lines 45-65*). As such, Underwood makes access control decisions using information about page sequences and not client node information. Therefore, Underwood fails to disclose making an access control decision based on information about the client node.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 30. Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 30 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-13, 18-29, 46 and 47 depend on and

incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 31-33, 35-39, and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30. Thus, dependent claims 2-13, 18-29, 31-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: December 19, 2008

/Christopher J. McKenna/
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000